

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

September 2, 1998
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

| # | Agenda Items | Presenters |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. | Meeting Minutes | Anne Keene |
| 2. | CATS Report | Robyn Oatley |
| 3. | EAARS Report | Anne Keene |
| 4. | Revisit Issues | Anne Keene |
| 5. | CATS Evaluation Proposals | Sue Rigney |
| 6. | New Kentucky Teacher Newsletter | Robyn Oatley |
| 7. | Subcommittee Reports | Anne Keene |
| 8. | Highly Skilled Educators | David Allen / Bob Lumsden |
| 9. | Accountability Index Model | Dr. Stephen Daeschner |
| 10. | Accountability Index Model | Dr. James Catterall |
| 11. | Future Meetings | Anne Keene |
| Adjournment | | |

SCAAC Meeting Minutes
September 2, 1998

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.

Chairperson Anne Keene called the meeting to order. Jon Frederick called the roll.

Members Present:

| | | |
|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Jon Akers | Gary Mielcarek | Sharon Solomon |
| Suzanne Guyer | Roger Pankratz | John Stephens |
| Maxie Johnson | Bob Sexton | Maynard Thomas |
| Anne Keene | Linda Sheffield | Robert Young |
| Benny Lile | | |

1. Meeting Minutes

Anne Keene

Anne Keene asked the Council to review the draft minutes from August 4th so that they could be revised and approved.

John Stephens moved to approve the minutes of August 4; the motion was seconded by Linda Sheffield. Motion was carried by unanimous voice vote.

Chairperson Anne Keene gave an overview of the agenda and issues the Council would be discussing today and in future meetings. She called attention to the meeting dates and the number of members who indicated they could attend, so that the Council can look forward to available dates when a quorum would be present. Anne also noted that during the afternoon session Dr. James Catterall would be in attendance to answer questions.

Total Meeting Time: 9 hours and 15 minutes.

2. CATS Report

Robyn Oatley

Robyn Oatley was recognized to report on the feedback from communications efforts regarding CATS. The Council members were given copies of Robyn's written report. Robyn highlighted the major points of the report including comments from student populations. One of the major parts of the report emphasized students' opinions that the test would only be taken more seriously if the assessments counted for something or had some impact on them such as college entrance or graduation/promotion. Robyn noted a part of the written report which stated there were "massive concerns that if the 12th graders had to retake any portion of the test Spring 1999, they would not be motivated to try at all. It was too long and too hard last year for them to have to take any portions of the test again this year." Robyn also reported that the writing portfolios received both negative and affirmative comments, but that most felt that the writing

portfolios were just add-ons. Students also felt that time spent was too great and that time was taken from other content.

On a positive note, students felt that the portfolio promoted better writing skills. Students also were asked to comment of what they felt teachers think about KIRIS; answers included "a good idea that needs fixing," "good idea but frustrating," "is a good idea but impractical in classroom life," "an obstacle in a normal curriculum," "necessary assessment in education," and "depends on the teacher, good teachers care!" The full report was handed out to all Council members for further review. Teacher comments were also bulleted on the report on issues concerning assessment and accountability. The report ended with a letter from the Kentucky Council of Teachers of English and Language Arts in support of counting writing portfolios in the accountability index at 15%: 3% for the on-demand writing and 12% for the writing portfolio.

Jon Akers reported that he had done some research on the same issues Robyn's report covered and noted that he found similar comments overall; Bob Young also had canvassed educators in Boone County and noted that there was some distinction made in the opinion on spring/fall testing based on whether the assessment were split between grades and when the testing would take place.

Bob Sexton brought up the problem or necessity of naming the assessment; he noted that most groups including the press and the department refer to the "CATS test." He expressed his opinion that it was now time to deal with this task. He suggested that Robyn Oatley might be able to get some suggestions for a name through a public process. Robyn asked if it would be appropriate for her to proceed with this activity. It was agreed that she should proceed with this activity.

3. EAARS Report

Anne Keene

Chairperson Anne Keene attended the Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee meeting in August and presented a draft handout of the discussion and concerns. All Council members were given a copy of the three column matrix which had the Council's recommendations to date on it. The EAARS asked Anne Keene what percent of the total work to be done was complete. She was not able to give more than a general answer. EAARS also asked the Council to consider the issues of home schooling and the data for successful transition to adult life. The EAARS was generally pleased with the percentages recommended in reading and math at the elementary level and suggested that the middle school level might need the same focus or percentages in reading and math.

4. Revisit Issues

Anne Keene

Maynard Thomas suggested that the Council should be clear about whether or not they should revisit issues dealt with in the past recommendations, especially since the timelines are difficult and there is still much to be done to complete the work. John

Stephens expressed his opinion that the Council has worked very long and hard on the issues, and he is concerned that the Council be able to move forward without revisiting issues. In response, Jon Akers expressed his feeling that the Council must get input from as many organizations and people as possible. Otherwise, he feels the Council would be remiss not to heed advice from all stakeholders. There was further discussion of these perspectives.

Jon Akers asked if the Council would be ignoring the advice of groups, if so then he feels he has no role to play in the process. Bob Sexton asked Jon to clarify what issues he was specifically referring to in this opinion; Jon noted that specifically the spring/fall issues and all issues for that matter. Maynard Thomas noted that while this group is advising, the Council should not overlook the fact that Kentucky Board of Education is receiving advice from all the various advisory groups and the reports from Robyn Oatley as well.

Chairperson Anne Keene emphasized the importance of all the issues and the need to deal with the agenda laid out for the day.

Sue Rigney outlined the timeline for awarding contracts and what will be happening in the next few weeks as negotiations go forward rather quickly. Sue also advised that if the Council wished to revisit the spring/fall issues, then they should do that as quickly as possible.

The Chair asked if there was a motion to revisit the spring/fall testing recommendations. If so, this would go on the agenda for later this month. Maynard Thomas suggested that perhaps there needed to be some clarifications on just what was voted on since it now appears that some Council members seem to misunderstand what they voted for.

The discussion focused on high school testing: if it should be split and how it should be split between grades; whether testing in both spring and fall would be desirable.

Roger Pankratz put on the table the topic of whether the Council should look at splitting the major parts of the assessment between grades 10 and 11. Suzanne Guyer noted that she feels that the Council must look forward and beyond just equating issues for the next two years, since the accountability model will run to the year 2014. She suggested that perhaps the Council should revisit these issues at the next meeting with some feedback for review sent out to members before the meeting.

SCAAC Motion:

John Stephens moved that the Council move forward with today's agenda and then revisit the spring/fall issues at a future meeting. The motion was seconded by Gary Mielcarek.

Sharon Solomon asked if the time factor would allow for a delay in this discussion? Sue Rigney said that at best the Council would have to revisit the issues at the September

17th meeting and no later. Discussion followed. Motion carried without opposition by a voice vote. Sue Rigney asked for direction for the department staff insofar as what the Council will want in advance to review before revisiting the spring/fall issues. It was determined that the Council would need: issues on spring testing for grades other than 12th along with all recommendations previously reviewed. For clarification, John Stephens asked if the writing portfolios would remain at the senior level. It was agreed that this was the case. Sharon Solomon asked for rationales and all pro's and con's on the issues.

Bob Sexton expressed his opinion that the state has known for 10 years that testing seniors is unpopular and that seniors are difficult to motivate to take testing seriously. He frames the issue as one of deciding how to deal with high school assessment—what will be most successful without discounting the importance of what is taught at the twelfth grade. The question seems one of how to deal with what is an unpopular decision.

The Chair called a recess.

Anne Keene reconvened the Council have the recess.

Anne reiterated the great appreciation that she feels for the hard work of the Council and related that at the recent EAARS meeting the same appreciation was expressed by members of that subcommittee.

5. CATS Evaluation Proposals

Sue Rigney

Anne recognized Sue Rigney to explain the process used to evaluate the proposals for CATS. Sue noted that the process was moving at a good pace; the executive committee will be meeting soon to review all the evaluations given them from the various panels—including the technical panel and the cost evaluation panel. The process is on track.

Benny Lile asked for some information on the recent test blueprint planning and core content match activities on those tests that were bid. Benny noted that those from his district who took part were very impressed with the work and that teachers were involved in the process. Sue discussed the work of the two groups. Roger Pankratz asked for information on the long term test blueprint activities and voiced his concern that any final decision needed to be put out for public comment. Anne Keene remarked that the legislature had expressed a desire for more teacher involvement; therefore, the recent activities had involved classroom teachers from all regions, all grade levels, and all content areas.

6. New Kentucky Teacher Newsletter

Robyn Oatley

Anne Keene recognized Robyn Oatley to comment on the new Kentucky Teacher newsletter. Copies were distributed to the Council members.

It was noted that the Kentucky Board of Education would need certain recommendations as soon as possible for the October 7th meeting.

7. Subcommittee Reports

Anne Keene

Anne Keene asked for the subcommittees to comment on their meetings if they had met to date.

She noted that recommendations on the School Report Card would need to go to the Kentucky Board of Education at their December meeting. Sue Rigney noted that the Kentucky Board of Education had on its three month calendar decisions concerning the components of the School Report Card.

Maxie Johnson reported on the first meeting of the Student Accountability Subcommittee. She highlighted the discussion points and handed out a report the Subcommittee compiled. All Council members were provided a copy of the report. Among the issues discussed were the spring/fall testing issues; the purpose of developing a student accountability model; ways to use assessment data to directly impact students; motivational issues; and implications for remedial services to assist students to achieve more and address specific needs of individual students. Maxie noted that the Subcommittee spent most of their meeting time discussing the uses of data for remediation and diagnostics for student achievement.

Roger Pankratz expressed his concern that there is a gap in the level of competence at the school level in interpreting data correctly and using the data productively and effectively.

Anne Keene related a conversation she had had with Deputy Commissioner Gene Wilhoit which brought up the possibility of having outside consultants from other states who might come for a working session with the Council on the student accountability issues.

Sue Rigney noted that Commissioner Cody was interested in having each subcommittee of the Council staffed by the department. She suggested that there would need to be some planning to procure the best consultants and resources from the state for the working sessions of the subcommittees. The Council would need to decide on target dates for meetings and the kinds of resources required.

It was noted that developing a student accountability model would be an enormous task and would require resources. Bob Sexton suggested that the Council ask now for such

assistance; Sue Rigney responded to Bob's suggestion and agreed to put the issue before the appropriate department staff.

Roger Pankratz commented briefly on the Scholastic Audit Subcommittee's work and work plans. Anne Keene asked Sue Rigney what process would be needed to set in motion staffing all the Council's subcommittees. She also asked that each committee report to her the names of chairpersons selected for each subcommittee and any other relevant information about their work/meetings/needs.

8. Highly Skilled Educators

**David Allen /
Bob Lumsden**

Chairperson Anne Keene recognized Gordon Newton and David Allen to comment on the Highly Skilled Educators Program recommendations.

The first issue discussed was how schools would qualify for Highly Skilled Educators assistance. Budgetary concerns will impose certain restrictions of necessity insofar as availability of Highly Skilled Educators and the level of assistance possible goes.

Gordon Newton addressed the Council briefly on the progress of the recommendations and noted that the Council would receive a more formal proposal at its next meeting. The plan is a forward looking program that will be fully operational in the year 2000. He expressed the concern to prioritize the use of personnel and monetary resources. The program is currently being developed.

David Allen addressed the Council discussing what schools would be eligible and the diversity of needs appropriate for those particular schools. In the past the assistance has been tailored to the specific needs of the schools identified or opting for services. The needs of the schools were determined by the staff within those schools; then, services and kinds of assistance were tailored for those needs as identified. David recommended that the program continue in this practice of needs identification and service delivery.

David Allen outlined the broad scope of how the previous Distinguished Educators programs assessed needs and granted funding. Under that model, schools submitted a School Transformation Plan including a highly specific budget in which the schools budgeted funds for activities; these School Transformation Plans were reviewed and approved or approved conditionally depending on the whether the school revised the School Transformation Plan. In some cases, programs were approved with little or no changes to the School Transformation Plan; other schools were asked to revise and improve the plans before allocation of funding.

Under the mandates of House Bill 53, schools would receive assistance based on individual needs and on a voluntary basis. The cadre of Highly Skilled Educators are offering a "menu" of services available to the schools. David noted that curriculum alignment continues to be a major concern. He noted that 5.5 million dollars are

presently allocated from school improvement funds. There are now 60 Highly Skilled Educators trained and ready to deliver services on the basis of need.

At this point, Gordon Newton expressed a desire to notify schools of the assistance package that will be available as soon as possible.

David Allen noted that needs varied among the schools which would qualify for assistance; some schools may require an Highly Skilled Educators to be assigned who could be there on a daily or more intensive basis; he stressed the importance of building leadership capacity and effective communication within the infrastructure of a school. Ideally the capacity building would empower the staff of a school to provide effective practices.

Gordon Newton compared the assistance determination process as a kind of triage approach in which schools needing the most assistance would be the priority schools for the Highly Skilled Educators Program. Benny Lile asked if there could be targeted areas of assistance in schools, that is, if a school needed more assistance because of low math scores would it be possible to provide assistance in that one content area only? This approach would free up Highly Skilled Educators to work in more than one school since such schools would not require a fulltime presence across all content areas on a daily basis.

General discussion followed on protocols and the selection process for Highly Skilled Educators assistance. The scholastic audit would be phased in as a key element in determining what schools need assistance. Over time, the scholastic audit would fold into the consolidated planning process.

Suzanne Guyer asked about the number of team members needed to serve on the scholastic audit process. Gordon Newton responded to Suzanne's question and noted that House Bill 53 mandated a set makeup with specific personnel to serve on a team.

Anne Keene asked what the process would be if there were a school in dire need of assistance prior to any scholastic audit? Would that school be able to acquire the necessary assistance?

Roger Pankratz suggested that schools with lower scores should be eligible for more resources. He suggests that the Council reinforce this principle. He gave the example: would a school with a 60 index not be as needy as a school with a 30 index.

The issue remains what schools get assistance and how much assistance. Would schools in rewards be eligible for assistance if they lost ground at some point? Only schools in decline would be eligible during the interim period.

Once a school is in decline and eligible for assistance, how much assistance would the school be eligible to receive? How would that determination be made? What are the determining factors for assistance and levels of assistance ? Would amount and type of

assistance be determined by need?

Gordon Newton noted that the DE and now the Highly Skilled Educators Program did and would use resources in addition to the cadre of Highly Skilled Educators. There are resources that can be drawn from other sources.

Chairperson Anne Keene asked if the Council had a motion at this point on the priorities for what schools would be eligible to receive assistance and what degree and kinds of assistance would be necessary and/or available.

Linda Sheffield expressed her concern that low scores not be the only indicator for assistance nor for the most assistance. She would like to see a more detailed plan that would determine eligibility for assistance. Is there now some design or model being developed by the department which could better inform the Council?

John Stephens read from House Bill 53 the language concerning assistance and the scholastic audit. His interpretation is that the audit would be done to determine the appropriateness of a school's classification based on the accountability index.

SCAAC Motion:

Bob Young moved to defer consideration on the Highly Skilled Educators Program until specifics of the scholastic audit are complete. The motion was seconded by Suzanne Guyer and Linda Sheffield. The motion carried by unanimous voice vote.

The chair recessed the Council for lunch at 12:40 p.m.

Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council after the lunch break. Jon Frederick called the roll; a quorum was present.

9. Accountability Index Model

**Dr. Stephen
Daeschner**

At this point, Anne Keene recognized Dr. Stephen Daeschner, Superintendent of Jefferson County Schools. Dr. Daeschner indicated that other Jefferson County staff were also present.

In his opening remarks, Dr. Daeschner defined equity and stated that equity recognizes that students and schools all progress at varying rates and that equity takes those variations into account. He further addressed the variables in assessment concerning student turnovers, socio-economic factors, gender issues, and ethnicity factors. He expressed his opinion that time is the most critical variable. He presented copies of a paper to the Council members.

Dr. Daeschner noted that he believed that all students can learn and that all students should be included in accountability. He noted from the paper that students can reach high expectations given the time and resources to do so. All students do not progress at the same rate, nor do they reach their goals at the same time. Dr. Daeschner highlighted the points included in the paper presented for the Council's considerations. (The paper "Comments to the School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council" was available for all those present and are not further outlined in this record of meeting minutes). In summary, Dr. Daeschner's remarks stated that he agreed with the linear straight-line model with a goal of 100 in 2014 as a way to set high standards for all schools, but he also noted that the model needs to consider equity issues.

According to the premises of the paper, the key to an equitable straight-line model is to have a justifiable progress zone. The proposal of the paper is that it would be reasonable to group schools with similar characteristics (high rates of at-risk students, high mobility) to set the bottom line of acceptable growth. This bottom line would allow for slower growth, but still require continual growth. The paper also contained charts. An acceptable growth zone under this plan establishes a natural control of the number of schools requiring assistance. As a first priority, all schools not meeting the acceptable growth pattern would be those schools eligible for assistance. As a second priority, the state could determine the specific schools who fall in the acceptable progress zone, but which are not progressing at an acceptable rate.

After his presentation and highlighting of the provided document, Dr. Daeschner answered questions. Maynard Thomas asked if Dr. Daeschner knew how many Jefferson County schools would reach the goal of 100 by 2012? Dr. Daeschner couldn't give exact figures but noted that he could run a model showing that number. After some consultation with his staff who were present, Dr. Daeschner noted that there might be a total of eight schools in the Jefferson County system who were on track to reach their goals by 2012. There was further discussion on the projected progress in Kentucky schools and how the schools might progress toward the goal of 100 by 2014.

Anne Keene commented that she liked the term "acceptable progress zone." Dr. Daeschner expressed his belief that there would need to be multiple bands reflecting equity issues; the premise is that all schools should not follow the same straight-line model with the exact parameters proposed in the straight-line model the Council had recommended previously. The bands and slope lines would need to vary in an equitable straight-line model of accountability.

Discussion followed on the problems of a design which would have varied models based on factors of at-risk, mobility and other equity issues. It was suggested that the public perceptions would pose a problem as parents looked at the schools in which there were lower expectations and slower growth rates expected or predicted. It would seem that parents would want to send their children to those schools with high growth rates and high expectations.

It was re-emphasized that the time to achieve the goal was the key piece in the argument. Discussion on a model which would provide different timelines for schools to reach the 100 goal followed. For example, schools beginning at a lower index might have as long as 2018 to reach the 100 goal. A discussion followed on what resources would be necessary to achieve the goal—what would it take to assist schools in reaching the desired goal?

Chairperson Anne Keene thanked Dr. Daeschner for his presentation. She noted that Dr. Daeschner had given the Council detailed and valuable information for their considerations on these issues.

10. Accountability Index Model

**Dr. James
Catterall**

Next, Anne Keene introduced Dr. James Catterall. Dr. Catterall noted that the "line" on the straight-line model needed to be a realistic, reasonable expectation. He expressed his opinion that now is the time to consider all the key issues surrounding the straight-line or other accountability index models.

There was a discussion of whether or not the Jefferson County Schools were typical of the entire the state. In determining a model for the entire state, would it be advisable to consider Jefferson County as representative of the state-at-large in constructing an accountability model? It was noted that there is data which would counter some of the premises of the Jefferson County paper. In particular, there are districts in high risk, low socio-economic areas which perform at high levels and even do better than districts at the other end of the continuum.

Bob Lumsden addressed the Council and re-emphasized that a key to school growth is good educational leadership—when that factor comes into play, the results show that good educational leadership is more important in how the school performs than other equity issues.

Jon Akers expressed his concern that if the accountability model is too convoluted and there are multiple configurations of growth lines and expectations, then this becomes a very difficult problem. How many configurations would be needed? Jon also expressed his concern that the state not send a message that low standards or mediocrity are acceptable.

Benny Lile followed up Jon Akers' remarks by noting that the 100 goal is not the absolute end of the growth line. In fact, that 100 mark is roughly 70% of the total possible goal of 140.

Anne Keene asked Dr. Catterall to speak to the point of whether or not the 100 goal by 2014 is reasonable, or if this is setting the state up for future problems or expectations that are too high or unrealistic.

Dr. Catterall answered that he feels that the system's philosophy is based on the ideal that schools should be able to reach proficiency, or 100 out of 140 by 2014. He noted that the system now says that if your school is farther behind, then that school will have to work harder to achieve the goal. This has been a key topic of discussion for the past 6-7 years in Kentucky. At this point, Dr. Catterall used a chart pad to illustrate some possible variations on the slopes or growth lines.

Chairperson Anne Keene asked Dr. Catterall and the Council to look over the chart "CATS Long-Term School Accountability Model" (8/4/98 revised). Dr. Catterall suggested that the Council may wish to look at the bands and consider options such as what would happen if a school either fell below the success line or rose above it for two or more cycles.

Anne Keene asked Dr. Catterall what he would consider the components of an school audit. His answer was that such an audit should not be done without some evidence that there are problems which may have impacted the assessment results in a dramatic way. Roger Pankratz asked what Dr. Catterall thought of having audits that might begin with an internal audit and then move forward with external audits from a team of outside experts. Dr. Catterall's answer was that it occurred to him that one phase would be the internal audit, and then, a second phase would involve a more in depth external audit.

At this point, Dr. Catterall addressed the eight questions on the handout provided for him from the Council. Dr. Catterall noted that there were many considerations including public relations and political considerations that the Council did have to deal with and consider. He mentioned that the growth rate chart for lower achieving schools looked very difficult or perhaps unrealistic on the surface. The underlying questions are--is the straight-line model realistic and could it happen? He noted that Kentucky has set very high standards and the model is certainly very specific. He noted that the model is more ambitious than those in most places. He also addressed the upward movement on the individual school success line going toward the 2014 goal. He felt that schools that walked that line in successive years would certainly deserve praise and rewards.

Discussion of the individual school success line and the on track-no consequence line on the model followed. The technical issues would include considerations of whether classifications would be made after one cycle or two years or any other configuration. Another technical issue is the fairness and reasonableness of the fluctuations in the various bands of the model.

Dr. Catterall commented that question 3 on the handout dealing with the size of the safety zone was not a technical question but was an educational question.

Sue Rigney asked the question about how low performers and high performers should be dealt with—what sort of construct would work and what are the problems? Dr. Catterall sees a problem with calling a school in decline or crisis which is in reality still performing at relatively acceptable, if not high, achievement. Classifying such schools

in any negative way seems unfair and unclear as to the actual level of achievement of that school.

On question 4, Dr. Catterall noted that many would say that the 100 point goal is unrealistic or bad, while many others would say that goal is high but should be held up as a goal to be attained.

So, the answer to this question varies. The point here seems to be setting the standard high but also at a realistic level. This is not so much a technical question as it is an educational question that educators within the state can answer better. The notion of a 3.5 or more gain per year and putting it out there, is a not a bad idea.

The Chairperson called an afternoon break.

Anne Keene reconvened the Council and the conversation with Dr. Catterall continued.

Dr. Catterall suggested that prior to calling in external auditors the local school should conduct its own assessment or audit of what the problems may be and how to account for any changes in school progress. Bob Lumsden asked Dr. Catterall if the basic question should be what kind of assistance a school required instead of whether or not a team could actually go into the school and determine through some scholastic audit answers to questions about how and why a certain school performed as it did. Bob Lumsden clarified that he was trying to emphasize the basic desired outcome of a scholastic audit—that outcome being to determine the exact kind of assistance a school might require.

Anne Keene read applicable passages from House Bill 53 regarding the scholastic audit portion of the bill. There seems to be a rather large scope of possibilities inherent in the bill's language. She further noted that the Council needed to be cognizant of all the possibilities.

Dr. Catterall noted that a one-time adjustment in correlation with an audit might be a positive step; he did not have any objection to the principle of making such a one-time adjustment. Bob Lumsden noted some real situations in which schools had made substantial gains and, yet, stood the chance of being in crisis in another cycle. A one-time adjustment would mitigate such cases.

On question 7 dealing with student mobility, Dr. Catterall advised that there are some cases in which the mobility rate would not substantially impact a longitudinal reporting model. The problem occurs with major shifts and not with subtle ones. For example, if a school had a large discrepancy in the number of kids at fourth grade who carried over and were tested in fifth, then this creates a bigger problem. Making sure that all enrolled students are tested is very important; Dr. Catterall noted that Kentucky has

been very tight in this area on insisting that all enrolled students are tested and not just those present on or during testing days. Dr. Catterall next addressed question 6 regarding a one-time goal adjustment. This kind of adjustment does allow some possibility for relaxing any problems with classifications or school progress.

On question 8 regarding how many items from KIRIS and CATS need to be comparable in order to have a firm basis for school accountability in the interim or cycle 4, Dr. Catterall said that CATS needs to be designed to look the way the state wishes. He noted that after CATS is fully designed, then the state can look at the two assessments and see what degree of overlap there is and how to work with those items. Getting CATS "right" is the goal, not to be overly concerned with overlap from KIRIS. The state needs to go public with what the assessment will look like and with an emphasis that this cycle ends the old model and the new model then comes into effect.

Suzanne Guyer asked if there would be some feedback from Dr. Catterall's panel on the straight-line model proposed before the Council makes its final recommendation? It was noted that the technical panel will respond to the straight-line design and the Council will have that advice to work with.

Bob Sexton asked Dr. Catterall to comment on the spring/fall testing issues and equating issues. Dr. Catterall said that the one transition period is problematic when testing is changed from spring to fall. He does not believe that the test can be equated if the testing changes from spring to fall. It would not be a problem to move from one spring to another spring at some point--that is not a problem. The problem occurs initially with changing from spring to fall.

Roger Pankratz asked Dr. Catterall to comment on changing grade levels tested. Dr. Catterall answered that much depended on the subject areas being tested.

Roger also asked about the feasibility of prioritizing certain content on the assessment; this would allow the teachers to understand how to prioritize in their instruction the content for assessment. The general answer is that this would be a very useful process.

Linda Sheffield raised the question of the number of pages for open-response questions.

Dr. Catterall said that from the statistics he had seen that limiting the number of lines or pages did not impact the scores significantly; however, he mentioned again the problems with those few students who may have trouble handling the limit due to handwriting or other issues of page limitation.

Anne Keene asked Dr. Catterall to report back to the Council prior to the September 17th meeting. He agreed that after his technical group meets he would report to the Council.

11. Future Meetings

Anne Keene

The Council looked at the meeting dates for October to decide the best time and when a quorum could be present. Council members were asked to inform Loretta Russell of any revisions to their personal calendars so that an accurate count could be done as soon as possible. October 14th and 26th and half a day on 27th were suggested. The next meeting dates are September 17th and 18th.

At the next meeting, the Council will take up the consequences and rewards elements and the scholastic audit and Commonwealth School Improvement Funds distributions.

John Stephens requested that the Council discuss the spring/fall test issues on the September 18th; it was noted that the Chair had already been asked to discuss that issue on September 17th. Sharon requested that the parental involvement issue be discussed at time when she could be present since she is a parent representative. It was agreed to take those issues up in October.

Adjournment

SCAAC Motion:

Motion to adjourn by Linda Sheffield; seconded by Benny Lile. The meeting was adjourned.